

Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to September 26, 2006 Final Office Action

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENT:

NOV 15 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 – 23 are in the application. Claims 1, 12, 14, 22, and 23 are currently amended; claims 19 and 21 were previously presented; claims 7, 12, and 16 are canceled, and claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11, 15, 17, 18, and 20 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter has been added to the application as a result of the amendments submitted herewith. Reconsideration and further examination of the application are respectfully requested.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to for including an informality. Specifically, the Examiner suggested that the word --a-- be added before the phrase "work or non-work state" at page 3, line 17. In reply thereto, paragraph [0014] of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0071361 A1, which includes the passage referenced by the Examiner, has been amended as suggested.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification at least now overcomes the objection of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of the Specification.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In reply thereto, claim 12 is submitted herewith for cancellation.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of the Specification.

Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to September 26, 2006 Final Office Action

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 - 6, 8 - 15, and 17 - 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 22, and 23 are currently submitted for amendment to correct the issue of insufficient antecedent basis noted by the Examiner. In particular, the former "said application" is amended to recite "an application".

Claim 14 is currently submitted for amendment to correct the issue of insufficient antecedent basis noted by the Examiner. In particular, the former "said first device" is amended to recite "said first associated device".

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 14, 22, and 23, at least as now currently amended, overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. Claims 2 - 6 and 8 - 13 depend from claim 1 and claims 15 and 17 - 21 depend from claim 14. Applicant therefore submits that all of claims 1 - 6, 8 - 15, and 17 - 23 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 - 6, 8 - 15, and 17 - 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoakum et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,658,095 (hereafter, Yoakum) in view of "SIP (Session Initiation Protocol) in Enterprise-Class IP Telephony Networks", White Paper, Communication without Boundaries, 2002, Avaya Inc. (hereinafter, Avaya), cited by applicant. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, Applicant respectfully notes that claim 1 relates to a method that includes configuring a first device as an associated device in a system where the first device is not registered with the system, and receiving information regarding a second device from a device management component, the

Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to September 26, 2006 Final Office Action

second device being registered with the system. Clearly, the claimed first device is an associated device that is not registered with a system and a second device is registered with the system. Applicant notes that claims 14, 22, and 23 are, relevant to the current 35 USC 103(a) rejection, worded similar to claim 1.

The Office Action states, "Yoakum does not expressly teach that the first device is not registered with the system". Applicant agrees with the Office but also respectfully submits that Yoakum expressly discloses much more. In fact Yoakum discloses, "[E]ach presence application 24 is associated with a subscriber device (not shown), and provides alerts to the associated subscriber based on presence information associated with a user and derived from the presence system 20 and identifies the users whose presence information is desired. The presence system 20 will accept these subscriptions as well as register participating users and their associated devices." (emphasis added) (See Yoakum, col. 4, ln. 47 – 49) Thus, it is clear that Yoakum expressly teaches that devices are both associated and registered with a presence system 20.

Therefore, Yoakum does more than merely not expressly teaching the first device is not registered with the system as admitted by the Office Action. Yoakum actually teaches that the first device is also registered with the system.

The Office Action cites and relies upon Avaya for disclosing both SIP- enabled and non SIP-enabled devices being associated with a user. The Office Action interprets the non SIP-enabled devices associated with the Avaya system as not being registered with the SIP system. Based on this assumption, the Office Action concludes it would have been obvious at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of Yoakum with the "non-registered" devices as taught by Avaya.

Applicant reiterates that Yoakum specifically and explicitly discloses and teaches associating and registering devices with a presence system, this includes all of the "various devices of the users". (See Yoakum, col. 4, ln. 37 – 38) However, combining the disclosures of Yoakum and Avaya as alleged by the Office Action (not admitted as

Application Serial No.: 10/874,013
Amendment and Response to September 26, 2006 Final Office Action

feasible by Applicant) would result in registering the devices disclosed in Avaya (e.g., SIP-enabled and non SIP-enabled devices) with the presence system 20 of Yoakum, in accordance with the express teachings of Yoakum.

Applicant further submits that the independent claims herein, 1, 14, 22, and 23, are not limited to an SIP system and/or SIP devices.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon combination of Yoakum and Avaya fails to render claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 obvious under 35 USC 103(a), for at least the reasons discussed in detail above.

Claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11, and 13 depend from claim 1; and claims 15 and 17 – 21 depend from claim 14. Applicant further submits that claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11, 13, 15, and 17 – 21 are also patentable over Yoakum and Avaya under 35 USC 103(a) for at least depending from patentable base claims.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 – 23 under 35 USC 103(a).

NOV 15 2006


Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to September 28, 2006 Final Office Action

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (650) 694-5339.

Respectfully submitted,

15 Nov 2006
Date


David D. Chung
Registration No. 38,409
(650) 694-5339

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Customer Number: 28524
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department
Telephone: 732-321-3026